1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND
3	
4	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
5	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA *
6	* * FEBRUARY 29, 2016
7	* 10:00 A.M. RAFFAELE MARZIALE *
8	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * PROVIDENCE, RI
9	
10	BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN J. McCONNELL, JR.,
11	DISTRICT JUDGE
12	(Change of Plea Hearing)
13	
14	APPEARANCES:
15	FOR THE GOVERNMENT: SANDRA R. HEBERT, AUSA U.S. Attorney's Office
16	50 Kennedy Plaza Providence, RI 02903
17	FOR THE DEFENDANT: THOMAS F. CONNORS, ESQ.
18	454 Broadway Providence, RI 02903
19	Court Reporter: Karen M. Wischnowsky, RPR-RMR-CRR
20	One Exchange Terrace Providence, RI 02903
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

```
29 FEBRUARY 2016 -- 10:00 A.M.
 1
 2
              THE COURT: Good morning, everyone. We're here
 3
      this morning for a change of plea in the case of the
      United States versus Raffaele Marziale.
 4
 5
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
              THE COURT: Did I say it right? Criminal Action
 6
      Number 15-120-03. Would counsel identify themselves
 7
 8
      for the record, please.
              MS. HEBERT: Sandra Hebert for the United
9
10
      States.
11
              THE COURT: Good morning, Ms. Hebert.
12
              MR. CONNORS:
                            Thomas F. Connors for
13
      Mr. Marziale, your Honor.
14
              THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. Connors.
15
              MR. CONNORS: Good morning, your Honor.
16
              THE COURT: Mr. Marziale, would you stand, and
17
      Ms. McGuire will swear you in.
18
              (Defendant sworn.)
19
                         Would you please state your name and
              THE CLERK:
20
      spell your last name for the record.
21
              MR. CONNORS: Raffaele Marziale,
22
      M-A-R-Z-I-A-L-E.
23
              THE COURT: Mr. Marziale, would you just pull
24
      the microphone in close to you.
```

Actually, Tom, the thing has popped off of it.

25

Great. Thanks.

Mr. Marziale, you're under oath, and that requires you to give me truthful answers to the questions I ask. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. And if you fail to give me truthful answers, further charges can be brought against you, like perjury or other charges. Do you understand that as well?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, Mr. Marziale, there's a plea agreement in this case that you signed, your attorney signed, the Government signed. Do you recall signing that plea agreement?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Okay. And did you sign that plea agreement after you read it?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And did you sign that plea agreement after you discussed it thoroughly with your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. I did.

THE COURT: And did he answer any questions that you had about that plea agreement?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, he did.

THE COURT: And did you knowingly and

voluntarily sign that plea agreement? 1 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did. 3 THE COURT: Sir, how old are you? 4 THE DEFENDANT: Forty-two. THE COURT: And how far did you go in school? 5 THE DEFENDANT: A couple years of community 6 college. I'm a couple credits short of an associate's 7 8 degree, I believe. 9 THE COURT: And have you been treated recently 10 for any mental illness or addiction to narcotic drugs? 11 THE DEFENDANT: No. 12 THE COURT: And as you sit here today, are you 13 under the influence of any medication, drugs or 14 alcoholic beverages of any kind? THE DEFENDANT: Well, I have a medical 15 condition, so I take medication every day. 16 17 THE COURT: Okay. What medicines do you take? 18 What medicines did you take yesterday or today? 19 THE DEFENDANT: I take medicine for my lungs. I 20 have pulmonary hypertension. Do you need the names of 21 the medicines or --22 THE COURT: If you know them. 23 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. TYVASO, it's an inhaling 24 It's a liquid medicine that goes in a 25 nebulizer. I do that four times a day. Adcirca,

they're two pills. They're for my lungs, to keep the pressure down. Letairis is another pill for my lungs. Omeprazole, it's a pill for pre-pharynx cancerous disease. I have scleroderma as well. Amlodipine, it's for -- I have Raynaud's. And a couple others, like vitamins, stuff I don't have the names.

THE COURT: Do any of the medications that you're taking now affect your ability to think clearly?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Do they cloud your head at all in any fashion?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Do they make you sleepy?

THE DEFENDANT: Sometimes.

THE COURT: When's the last time you took any of the medications that make you sleepy?

THE DEFENDANT: Well, it depends. I don't remember, but sometimes I can get joint pain and fatigued.

THE COURT: As you sit here today, have any of the medications affected your ability to think clearly?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: You feel fully -- despite the number of drugs that you're taking for various conditions, do you feel that you're able to make decisions in your own

best interest today?

THE DEFENDANT: Absolutely.

THE COURT: And your mind is clear?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, in addition to the plea agreement, have you reviewed the Indictment, that is, the written charges that the Government has brought against you in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did.

THE COURT: And did you review those with your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did.

THE COURT: And did he answer any questions that you have about the Indictment or the consequences of the Indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, he did.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Marziale, are you completely satisfied with the representation that you've received from your attorney in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am.

THE COURT: Now, sir, if you change your plea to guilty -- strike that. Under the Constitution and laws of this country, you have certain rights. If you change your plea to guilty, you'll give up the rights that you currently have under the Constitution and laws

that I'm about to tell you.

I want to make sure that you understand that you have these rights and that by changing your plea to guilty, you'll give up these rights.

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: You have a right to plead not guilty as you have so far, and you have a right to continue in that plea of not guilty.

If you were to continue in the plea of not guilty, you would be entitled to a trial by a jury. At that trial, the Government would have to prove each and every element of the charges it brings against you beyond a reasonable doubt.

At that trial you would have a right to see, hear, confront, cross-examine, have your attorney do so, all of the evidence and the witnesses that the Government would put on in order to prove its case against you.

You would also have a right to present evidence in your own defense. In fact, you could compel people, subpoena them, to come to court to testify in your defense.

You would also have a right to testify at that trial. Perhaps more importantly, though, you would have a right not to testify. And if you chose not to

testify, that fact could not be used against you by the jury or the Court or anyone else.

You also have a right to counsel, and the Court would appoint counsel for you if you couldn't otherwise afford one; and the Court would appoint counsel for you throughout all of the proceedings.

But if you change your plea to guilty, you'll be giving up all of these rights that you have and there will be no trial. Do you understand that you have these rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: And do you understand that if you change your plea to guilty, there will be no trial and you'll give up all of these rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Now, sir, has anyone in any way attempted to force you to plead guilty or threatened you in any way to get you to plead guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: Has anyone made any promises or assurances to you other than what's contained in the plea agreement in order to get you to plead guilty in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: So are you knowingly and voluntarily

asking this Court to allow you to change your plea to guilty because you believe at this time it's in your personal best interest to do so?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Now, I want to describe to you what the maximum penalties are that you face at the time of sentencing for the five counts. My understanding is that you're prepared to plead guilty to Counts I, V, VI, XIII and XIX; is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: As to Counts I, V and VI, as to each of those counts, there's a maximum period of incarceration of 30 years, a maximum fine of one million dollars, a period of supervised release of five years, and there will be a \$100 mandatory special assessment.

As to Counts XIII and XIX, there's a mandatory two-year consecutive period of incarceration, consecutive to the sentence that's imposed as to Counts I, V or VI, there's a \$250,000 maximum fine, a one-year period of supervised release and a \$100 mandatory special assessment.

Now, if the Court were to impose the maximum sentence as to each of the counts and if the Court were to impose them consecutively, meaning to be served

consecutively, meaning one after the other, then the maximum period of incarceration the Court could impose is 94 years, there's a \$3.5 million fine, up to 17 years of supervised release, and there will be a \$500 mandatory special assessment.

Do you understand that these are the penalties, the maximum penalties, that the Court could impose at the time of sentencing?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that if the Court imposes a period of supervised release, that if you violate any of the conditions of supervised release, further jail time can be brought upon you? Do you understand that as well?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Mr. Marziale, are you a citizen of the United States?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am.

THE COURT: As a citizen of the United States, you have certain valuable civil rights that you could lose by pleading guilty to this felony.

You could lose the right to vote, the right to hold public office, the right to serve on a jury and the right to possess any kind of firearm or ammunition.

Do you understand that you could lose these

valuable civil rights if you plead guilty to these felonies?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Ms. Hebert, are there forfeiture allegations?

MS. HEBERT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Thanks.

Now, I want to make sure you understand how the Court will determine what an appropriate sentence is in this case. At some point after the change of plea, you'll be asked to meet with the Probation Department next door in the Pastore Building.

You have a right to have your attorney present with you for that interview, and I encourage you to make sure your attorney is present with you for that interview.

The Probation Department will interview you, and then they'll conduct other investigation, and they'll prepare a presentence report. That report will give me information about your background and various other information that the Court will use at the time of sentencing.

It will also calculate the advisory sentencing guidelines. Those are guidelines that assist the Court in determining what an appropriate sentence may be.

The Court has not determined what the advisory sentencing guidelines are yet.

Now, your attorney may have calculated what he thinks they'll be or the Government may have calculated them and told your attorney what it thinks they may be. I won't determine the advisory sentencing guidelines until after the presentence report is issued.

Your attorney and the Government's attorney have a chance to object to the calculation, I'll rule on the objections, and then I'll determine at the time of sentencing what the appropriate advisory guideline range is.

Do you understand as we sit here today we don't know what the advisory guideline range is?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Do you also understand, though, that you made certain concessions that will affect the guideline range?

So you made a concession that the amount of loss here falls in between \$250,000 and \$550,000. That will affect the guideline range. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Do you understand that you've agreed to that range?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you also understand that you've agreed that the crime involved here involved more than 10 victims and that by agreeing to that, that that will, in fact, affect the guideline range? Do you understand that as well?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. You won't have a right to object to either of those two as part of the guideline calculation. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that as part of the plea agreement you've agreed to waive any right to appeal the sentence that the Court imposes if the sentence is at or below the guideline range? Do you understand that as well?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. And, finally, do you understand that in the federal system at this time parole has been abolished; that is, there is no right to apply for parole from incarceration? You will serve the entire time that the Court imposes, minus some time off for good behavior, but there is no right to apply for parole the way there is in the state system. Do you understand that as well?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: I'm going to ask the U.S. Attorney, Assistant U.S. Attorney now to -- not U.S. Attorney yet, maybe some day, to tell us what the facts are that -- to tell us what the elements of the five counts are that you're prepared to plead guilty to and to tell us what facts the Government would introduce if this case were to go to trial.

I want you to pay particular attention to the facts because at the end of it, I'm going to ask if you admit the facts as stated by the Government as true.

Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Ms. Hebert.

MS. HEBERT: Yes, your Honor. The elements of conspiracy to commit bank fraud are as follows: First that the conspiracy charged in the Indictment existed between at least two people to commit bank fraud; second, the Defendant willfully joined in the agreement; and third, that one of the co-conspirators committed an overt act during the period of the conspiracy in an effort to further the purpose of the conspiracy.

The elements of bank fraud are as follows:

First, the financial institutions alleged in this case
to be Washington Mutual Bank, Flagstar Bank, Bank of

America, Wells Fargo and Sierra Pacific were federally insured or were Federal Reserve banks or members of the Federal Reserve system; second, the Defendant engaged in a scheme substantially as charged in the Indictment to defraud or made false statements or misrepresentations to obtain money from the institution; and third, that the Defendant acted knowingly.

The elements of aggravated identity theft are as follows: First, that the Defendant committed the crime of conspiracy to commit bank fraud and bank fraud; second, that during and in relation to those crimes, Defendant knowingly transferred, possessed or used without lawful authority the means of identification described in the Indictment.

Finally, with respect to some counts, the Defendant is charged with aiding and abetting. The elements of aiding and abetting are, first, that someone else committed the charged crime and, second, that the Defendant consciously shared the person's knowledge of the underlying criminal act, intended to help him and willfully took part in the endeavor seeking to make it succeed.

Had this case proceeded to trial, the Government's evidence would have established the

following facts with regard to the Defendant: First, the Government would ask the Court to incorporate the facts alleged in the Indictment.

Secondly, the Government would have established the following: Beginning on or about October 9th, 2007, and continuing until on or about December 16th, 2013, the Defendant, Raffaele Marziale, conspired with real estate attorney and broker Louis Marandola, loan originator Brian McCaffrey, loan processor Lauren Sienko, real estate agent Gina Ronci Mohamed and real estate investor Edwin Rodriguez to commit bank fraud in connection with the purchase, sale and mortgage financing of residential real estate.

The conspirators devised an elaborate scheme to fraudulently obtain residential real estate loans, many of them insured by the Federal Housing Administration, through the submission of false documents to lenders and the concealment of material facts from those lenders.

The co-conspirators also stole money from the buyers and sellers of real estate who had sought assistance from the conspirators with real estate transactions. They often did this by creating two sets of documents accounting for the expenses associated with the real estate transaction.

Prior to June 2010, Marziale worked as a loan officer for Evergreen Mortgage Advisors in Lincoln, Rhode Island. Marandola, McCaffrey and Sienko worked in the same office building as Marziale in Lincoln, Rhode Island.

In 2007, Marziale and Sienko assisted McCaffrey in obtaining a mortgage loan from Washington Mutual Bank to purchase 15 Metcalf Street, Providence, Rhode Island, a property owned by Marandola and Joseph Picozzi, Marziale's employer at this time.

McCaffrey's loan application included false supporting documents, including a false HUD-1 form prepared by Marandola and a false verification of mortgage form signed by Sienko. The verification of mortgage form was also signed by McCaffrey and Marandola's wife.

Washington Mutual ultimately approved McCaffrey's loan based in part upon the fraudulent documents submitted.

Marandola, through his real estate escrow and title insurance business, Amerititle, LLC, served as the settlement agent for the closing of McCaffrey's fraudulently obtained Washington Mutual loan.

Several years later in 2010, Marandola moved his law office to 715 Branch Avenue, Providence, Rhode

Island. McCaffrey, who accepted a job as a branch manager for Sierra Pacific Mortgage Company in 2010, decided to share office space and expenses with Marandola unbeknownst to Sierra Pacific.

Sienko, who was hired by Sierra Pacific to serve as a loan processor, went with McCaffrey to 715 Branch Avenue.

In July 2011, Marandola and Amerititle were barred from serving as settlement agent by Sierra Pacific. As a result, Marandola created Clean Close Title & Escrow.

In order to continue to do business with Marandola, who paid expenses associated with the Branch Avenue operation, McCaffrey and Sienko represented to Sierra Pacific that Attorney Robert McNelis served as the closing attorney on behalf of Clear Close when, in fact, the loans were closed by Marandola.

Marziale moved to Branch Avenue with Marandola, McCaffrey and Sienko. Marziale, who had been unable to obtain a loan originator license despite multiple attempts, began to work as a loan officer under McCaffrey's name and license. Marziale did this with McCaffrey's knowledge and consent.

To conceal Marziale and Marandola's involvement from their supervisors and corporate personnel at

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Sierra Pacific, McCaffrey and Sienko asked Marziale and

Marandola to leave the offices when Sierra Pacific

personnel came for a visit.

In order to effectuate the scheme, each co-conspirator had a role to play without which this scheme could not have succeeded. Marandola, who served as the settlement or closing agent on the fraudulent real estate transactions alleged in the Indictment, controlled the funds through his escrow account, paying expenses of the scheme and paying Marziale, McCaffrey, Sienko and others for their efforts to close the loans.

Marandola created and approved false documents as part of the scheme. Marziale, working as a loan officer, often impersonated McCaffrey with prospective borrowers.

Marziale created or caused to be created false documents in support of the loans which he then provided to Sienko and McCaffrey for submission to Sierra Pacific.

It was Marziale's practice to e-mail McCaffrey and Sienko when he had a borrower coming who thought Marziale was McCaffrey so that they would know to play Sienko assisted Marziale by directing borrowers to contact Brian at Marziale's number.

McCaffrey and Sienko as Sierra Pacific employees

submitted the loan documents for loans originated by Marziale to Sierra Pacific under McCaffrey's name and license. McCaffrey, who received compensation from Sierra Pacific for loans originated by Marziale, caused Sierra Pacific to compensate Marziale for his work by submitting false invoices to Sierra Pacific for marketing services.

Through these false invoices, McCaffrey caused Sierra Pacific to pay Marziale for marketing when, in fact, Marziale was working as an unlicensed loan officer.

Ronci worked as a real estate agent under
Marandola. She assisted the conspirators in getting
approval for the loans sought by creating documents and
listing properties, giving the false impression that
she actually listed and marketed the properties when,
in fact, she did not. She did this so as to give the
false impression that the real estate transactions were
arm's length.

Many of the fraudulent loans described in the Indictment and originated by Marziale through McCaffrey and Sienko were for properties owned by Rodriguez under the name of family members.

These properties include 50 Chatham Street,
35 Robin Street, 55 Gillen Street, 71 Wallace Street

and 46 Magdalene Street.

Additionally, 71-73 Parnell Street was owned by an associate of Rodriguez's. Rodriguez recruited buyers for the homes and had them apply for a loan through Marziale, McCaffrey and Sienko.

Marziale, McCaffrey and Sienko had no contact with the borrowers. They went through Rodriguez, and they did not verify documents provided to them by Rodriguez.

When Marziale needed a verification of rent form or an insurance binder completed for the loan application, he asked Rodriguez to complete the forms. He was initially directed to do this by McCaffrey and Sienko who had worked with Rodriguez in the past.

As alleged in Count VI of the Indictment,

Marziale obtained a false verification of rent form,

false bank statements and a false insurance binder from

Rodriguez in connection with the loan for 35 Robin

Street.

For the 35 Robin Street loan, as well as the other loans associated with properties owned by Rodriguez, Marandola did not collect a down payment and Attorney McNelis was falsely listed as the closing attorney on documents submitted to Sierra Pacific.

Several other properties involved in this scheme

were properties owned or controlled by Marandola and Marziale or their associates, such as 63 Wendell Street, 52-54 Bergen Street, 61 Ledge Street, 12 Sue Street and 245-47 Jewett Street.

In some instances, buyers were located by Rodriguez, who was paid for his efforts, and in other instances Marziale located a buyer.

With these loans, fraudulent supporting documents were submitted, no down payment was collected and Attorney McNelis was falsely identified as the closing attorney.

Additionally, Ronci was falsely identified as a real estate agent negotiating the transactions when, in fact, the transactions were negotiated or arranged by Marziale and Marandola or, in the case of 245-47 Jewett Street, the seller of the property.

As alleged in Counts V and XIII of the Indictment, 12 Sue Street was a property owned by DQ. Marziale recruited a buyer for this property, JT, a young woman who was a friend of his family member.

Marandola caused paperwork to be submitted to the seller, DQ, indicating that the property sold for \$55,000. Meanwhile, Marziale caused false paperwork to be submitted to Sierra Pacific reflecting that the property sold for \$175,000.

DQ's signature was forged on documents submitted to Sierra Pacific. Marziale signed documents falsely representing that JT was his niece, giving the false impression that he was an approved source of gift funds for the down payment.

JT, a first-time home buyer, purchased 12 Sue Street with a federally insured loan in the amount of \$175,563. She has since defaulted on this loan.

As alleged in Count XIX of the Indictment,

Marziale and Marandola employed similar techniques in

arranging for the purchase of 61 Ledge Street in the

name of Marziale's mother.

The documents and funds provided to DQ, the seller, reflected that the sale price was \$62,000. However, Marziale obtained a loan from Sierra Pacific in his mother's name in the amount of \$171,830 purportedly to purchase 61 Ledge Street from DQ.

To obtain approval for the loan, he and Marandola caused DQ's name to be forged on documents submitted to Sierra Pacific and deeds filed with the City of Providence.

By engaging in this scheme, Marziale was and the other co-conspirators were unjustly enriched at the expense of lenders, the FHA, buyers and, on occasion, sellers.

THE COURT: Thanks, Ms. Hebert.

Mr. Marziale, you've heard the elements of the charges that the Government has brought against you that you -- I understand you're prepared to plead guilty to.

Do you understand that the Government would have to prove each and every one of those elements beyond a reasonable doubt in order for you to be found guilty of any of those counts?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: You also heard the facts that the Government would prove if this case were to go to trial. Do you admit the facts as stated by the Government as true?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Before I ask you about your change of plea, do you have any questions for the Court or do you want to confer with your attorney about any matter?

THE DEFENDANT: No. I'm okay.

THE COURT: How do you now plead, Mr. Marziale, to Counts I, V, VI, XIII and XIX of the Indictment brought against you, guilty or not guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Guilty.

THE COURT: This Court has heard from the Government the evidence it would present if this matter

were to go to trial. The Court has questioned the 2 Defendant regarding his understanding of the nature of

the proceedings and the consequences of entering a plea

4 of guilty to the charge.

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

It is, therefore, the finding of this Court in the case of the United States versus Raffaele Marziale that the Defendant is fully capable and competent of entering an informed plea, that the Defendant is aware of the nature of the proceedings and the consequences of the plea and that the plea of guilty is a knowing and voluntary plea supported by an independent basis in fact containing each of the essential elements of the charges; and, therefore, the plea is accepted, and the Defendant is now adjudged guilty of those charges.

Sentencing will be set down for May 24th, 2016, at 10 a.m.

Ms. Hebert, anything further for the Government?

MS. HEBERT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Any position on Mr. Marziale's continued release?

MS. HEBERT: No objection to continued release, your Honor.

> THE COURT: Okay. Thanks.

Mr. Connors, anything further for Mr. Marziale?

MR. CONNORS: No, your Honor. Thank you.

```
THE COURT: Mr. Marziale, the conditions that
 1
 2
      were placed upon you at the time of your initial
 3
      arraignment and release remain in full force and effect
      until the time of sentencing. Do you understand that?
 4
 5
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
              THE COURT: Great. We'll stand adjourned.
 6
7
       Thanks.
              (Adjourned.)
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATION I, Karen M. Wischnowsky, RPR-RMR-CRR, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes in the above-entitled case. ___June 27, 2016 Date /s/ Karen M. Wischnowsky____ Karen M. Wischnowsky, RPR-RMR-CRR Federal Official Court Reporter